



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/687,100 | 10/15/2003 | Barclay Fred Burns | 5594-002 | 7245 |

7590 06/03/2005

Julie L. Reed
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 S.W. Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SAADAT, CAMERON

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3713

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/687,100

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL.

Examiner

Cameron Saadat

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/2/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/18/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In response to amendment filed 3/2/2005, claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mann, II et al. (USPN 5,577,186; hereinafter Mann).

Regarding claims 1 and 17, Mann discloses a method and system for simulating application software, comprising: presenting a generic application user interface having elements common to several different software packages of a particular type of software application to a user across a network (Col. 4, lines 56-63); receiving user inputs during an interaction with the user interface; and evaluating performance of the user for the type of software application based upon the user inputs (Col. 3, line 57 – Col. 4, line 10).

Regarding claim 2, Mann discloses a method wherein the user is provided with of his or her performance (Col. 4, lines 4-10).

Regarding claim 6, Mann discloses a method, comprising collecting all of the user inputs and evaluations of the user inputs and generating an evaluation report of the performance of the user for the particular type of software application (Col. 4, lines 4-10).

Regarding claim 7, Mann discloses a method, further comprising presenting a generic user interface for a presentation application.(Col. 7, lines 50-65).

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding claims 8 and 19, Mann discloses a method of providing a user interface, comprising: providing an introduction to a problem for a user; identifying tools to solve the problem, wherein the tools include at least one software application of a particular type; instructing the user on concepts and tools to be used in a solution; interacting with the user using the tools; displaying the solution; and providing the user with a summary of the problem and solution (Col. 3, lines 9-26).

Regarding claim 10, Mann discloses a method, wherein interacting with the user further comprises receiving and evaluating a user input (Col. 8, lines 47-59).

Regarding claim 11 and 18, Mann discloses a method, wherein interacting with the user further comprises providing feedback on performance (Col. 4, lines 1-3).

Regarding claim 12, Mann discloses a method, wherein providing feedback further comprises indicating that the user made a correct input (Col. 8, lines 50-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann, II et al. (USPN 5,577,186; hereinafter Mann) in view of Cook et al. (USPN 5,727,950; hereinafter Cook).

Regarding claims 3-5 and 13, Mann discloses all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing the feature of presenting a user with an opportunity to try again (as per claims 3, 4, and 13); providing a hint to a user (as per claim 4); and demonstrating the correct input (as per claim 5). However, Cook teaches a tutorial system wherein a user provides an input and the user is informed that the input is incorrect, and presenting the user with an opportunity to try again (See Fig. 5, refs. 405-407); demonstrating the correct input and providing a hint (See Fig. 4). Thus, in view of Cook, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the feedback described in Mann, by providing hints, demonstrating correct input, and providing a user the opportunity to try again, in order to provide a virtual tutor that guides a user through learning materials.

Regarding claims 9, 15, and 16, Mann discloses a method all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing the feature of storing user input. However, Cook teaches a tutorial system wherein user interactions are stored (Col. 48, lines 20-32). Hence, in view of Cook, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tutorial system described in Mann, by storing user inputs, in order to collect and provide indication of a user's current and past performance data.

Regarding claim 14, Mann discloses a method of providing an integrated technology learning system, comprising the steps of: establishing technology objectives for an instructional unit; identifying core curriculum components related to the technology objectives (See Fig. 3; determining a framework for problem solving; determining common elements of a user interface for at least one particular type of software application (Col. 4, lines 56-63); and adding simulation functionality for that particular type

Art Unit: 3713

(Col. 3, line 57 – Col. 4, line 10). Mann discloses all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing the feature of providing a theme and characters. However, Cook teaches a tutorial system comprising various themes and characters (Col. 14, lines 30-54). Hence, in view of Cook, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the tutorial system described in Mann, by providing various themes and characters in order to provide a virtual coach that engages a user's interest based on his or her preferences.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Chan et al. (USPN 6,692,256) – disclose an interactive tutorial system for software.
- McKiel et al. (USPN 5,388,993) – disclose a tutorial that provides demonstration of product functions.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cameron Saadat whose telephone number is (571) 272-4443. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cameron Saadat
May 27, 2005



JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER